



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,632	11/05/2003	Mary G. Hoffee	A-8427	8127

23373 7590 02/23/2006
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

BLANCHARD, DAVID J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1643

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/700,632

Applicant(s)

HOFFEE ET AL.

Examiner

David J. Blanchard

Art Unit

1643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-71 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C.

121:

- I. Claims 1-32 and 59-62, drawn to anti-CD33 antibodies, classified in class 530, subclass 387.3.
- II. Claims 33-56, drawn to a method of treating a disease in a patient comprising administering an anti-CD33 antibody, classified in class 424, subclass 133.1.
- III. Claims 57-58, drawn to a method of diagnosing myelogenous cancer in a biological sample comprising contacting the biological sample with a labeled anti-CD33 antibody and detecting the distribution of the antibody within the sample, classified in class 435, subclass 7.23.
- IV. Claims 63-70, drawn a polynucleotide encoding an anti-Cd33 antibody, a vector, host cells and a method of producing the anti-CD33 antibody, classified in class 536, subclass 23.53.
- V. Claim 71, drawn to a method of isolating CD33 from a biological sample comprising contacting the biological sample with an anti-CD33 antibody, allowing the antibody to bind CD33 in the biological sample and isolating the antibody-CD33 complex from the biological sample, thereby isolating CD33, classified in class 530, subclass 413.

Art Unit: 1643

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of groups I and IV represent separate and distinct products, which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods, which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. The antibody of Group I and the polynucleic acid of Group IV are all structurally and chemically different from each other. The polynucleotide is made by nucleic acid synthesis, while the antibody is raised by immunization. Furthermore, the polynucleotide can be used for hybridization screening, the antibody can be used to purify the antigen, for example. The examination of each group would require different searches in the U.S. Patent shoes and the scientific literature and would require the consideration of different patentability issues. Thus, the inventions of groups I and IV are patentably distinct.

The methods of Inventions II-III and V differ in the method objectives, parameters, reagents used and have different endpoints. Invention I recites a method of treating a disease in a patient comprising administering an anti-Cd33 antibody; Invention III recites a method of diagnosing myelogenous cancer in a biological sample comprising contacting the biological sample with a labeled anti-CD33 antibody and detecting the distribution of the antibody within the sample; Invention V recites a method of isolating CD33 from a biological sample comprising contacting the biological sample with an anti-CD33 antibody, allowing the antibody to bind CD33 in the biological sample and isolating the antibody-

Art Unit: 1643

CD33 complex from the biological sample, thereby isolating CD33. The examination of all groups would require different searches in the U.S. Patent shoes and the scientific literature and would require the consideration of different patentability issues. Thus, inventions II-III and V are separate and distinct in having different method objectives, method steps, parameters, and reagents used and different endpoints and are patentably distinct.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antibody of Group I can be used in a materially different method such as the materially different methods of Groups III and V for diagnosis of CD33 expressing cancers and to purify CD33 in addition to the materially different therapeutic method of Group II, which differs in the method steps, parameters, reagents used and endpoint.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and different classifications, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend

Art Unit: 1643

from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance; whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship

Art Unit: 1643

must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Blanchard whose telephone number is (571) 272-0827. The examiner can normally be reached at Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM, with alternate Fridays off. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms, can be reached at (571) 272-0832. The official fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Respectfully,
David J. Blanchard
571-272-0827

